

APPEAL	Non NABC+ TWELVE
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Rick Beye
Event	Regional Knockouts
Session	First Session
Date	July 31, 2010

BD#	12
VUL	NS
DLR	W

Nancy Arnold	
♠	532
♥	J873
♦	853
♣	875

George Fox		Summer 2010 New Orleans, LA	Vic Sowers	
♠	Q64		♠	A7
♥	AKT64		♥	52
♦	T6		♦	AQJ97
♣	J92		♣	K643

Jim Darvey	
♠	KJT98
♥	Q9
♦	K42
♣	AQT

West	North	East	South
2♥ ¹	P	2N ²	P
3♣	P	3♥ ³	3♠
P	P	P	

Final Contract	3♠ by South
Opening Lead	♥A
Table Result	Down 3, EW +300
Director Ruling	3♥ W down 1, NS +50
Panel Ruling	3♠ S, down 3, EW +300

(1)	Alerted as 5+ Hearts, 9-11 HCP
(2)	Relay to 3♣
(3)	Described to North-South as invitational with 4 Hearts

The Facts: South asked for the meaning of the 3♥ bid at his turn to call. West described 3♥ as invitational with four hearts. South bid 3♠ and went down three for -300. North-South called the Director at the conclusion of the hand reporting that the misinformation had caused South to bid 3♠. East-West agreed that the correct information for the 3♥ bid is invitational with two hearts, not four hearts. South stated that he would be less willing to bid 3♠ with the correct information.

The Ruling: The Director polled six players: Two players thought little of South's decision to bid 3♠ and thought he had set up an expected problem. Four of the players polled reported having sympathy for the argument of South even though they might not

have bid 3♠. The Director applied Laws 40 B.4. and 12 C.1.E and changed the result to 3♥ by West, down one, for NS +50.

The Appeal: East-West appealed and all four players attended the Panel hearing. North-South argued that when East-West are known to have a nine-card fit, it is more attractive to bid, but if it was known that they only had a seven-card fit, the 3♠ bid becomes much riskier. East-West argued that whatever the meaning of 3♥, bidding at this vulnerability was very risky.

The Decision: The Panel polled seven players to get their opinion of the South hand. One player reported that he would double 2NT, while the other six passed 2NT and 3♥. All six were adamant that it was right to pass 3♥ whatever the meaning of 3♥. While there was misinformation according to Law 40, the poll showed that the 3♠ bid didn't hinge on the meaning of 3♥. The Panel decided that the misinformation did not lead to the bad result. The 3♠ bid was made after an invitational call by East and before West had a chance to accept the invitation. Because virtually no one would bid 3♠ regardless of the meaning of 3♥, Law 21 B.3. does not apply. Therefore, the Panel ruled that the table result of 3♠ by South, down 3, EW +300 is reinstated.

The appeal was found to have substantial merit.

The Panel: Sue Doe (Chairman), Olin Hubert, and Bernie Gorkin.

Commentary:

Bramley: I disagree. Maybe bidding is anti-percentage, as indicated by the poll, but the misinformation was relevant to THIS South. Clearly, bidding is more attractive when partner is known to have very few hearts, which has the twofold effect of increasing his offensive potential and decreasing his defensive potential. South was caught in a double-whammy. On the info he had, he was entitled to expect that either 3♥ or 3♠ would make, maybe both. Moreover, if E/W had 9+ hearts then North must have a few high cards, else the opponents would have already bid game.

The E/W argument is lame. Of course bidding is risky, but, as N/S argued, it's MUCH riskier in the face of a seven-card fit than a nine-card fit. Essentially, the Panel is saying that bidding is insane under any circumstances, an egregious error, bad enough to sever the link between the MI and the outcome.

I would have ruled the same as the Director, 3♥ down one for both sides. The play in 3♥ can have many variations, nearly all of which result in down one. Finally, I would have found no merit.

Goldsmith: I think the director's ruling is far better than the Panel's Ruling. The real question is whether there was any merit to the E/W appeal. That is a close call.

Rigal: I am not happy with the decision of the polled players. If I were asked if I would bid 3♠ with the right information I would say no. With the knowledge that East had four hearts, I am not sure. So N/S were damaged and the TD ruling looks better than the Panel's Ruling.

Wildavsky: The TD got this one right. The Panel ruling was unjust.

Everyone would agree that correct information makes Pass more attractive. That is all we need to know to adjust the EW score – they cannot be allowed to profit through MI, per Law 21B3. Normally we adjust the score for the NOS as well, unless we judge that the call was a serious error per law 12C1(b). The New Orleans ACBL LC minutes follow the lead of the WBF and instruct us that the standard for "serious error" is high, something like a revoke or failure to cash the setting trick against a slam, not a mere error in judgment.

Wolff: While I do not agree with the polled players assessment, thinking that it made a big difference whether East had 4 hearts or not and I would then bid 3 spades or at least strongly consider it. Remember when partner has not more than 2 hearts there is more room in his hand to have more spades, but this is not a how to play bridge class so I'll respect the poll and not talk against the Panel's Decision. However EW needs to have a CD penalty for not knowing their conventions, which, in turn would mitigate the penalty against NS.

WHY AREN'T OUR TD'S AND APPEALS COMMITTEES MORE TUNED IN TO THE EVILS OF CD? I have never heard anyone who can adjudicate it properly nor learn to live with it constantly, but in spite of this, no one seems to really try and eliminate it. WHY???????